

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

CORINNA BRIDGETT OLESON,
and SALAL PARK, INC., an
Oregon non-profit corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

WASHINGTON MUTUAL BANK, N.A.,
et al.,

Defendants.

No. CV 08-1072-HU

OPINION AND ORDER

MOSMAN, J.,

On August 6, 2009, Magistrate Judge Hubel issued Findings and Recommendation ("F&R") (#48) in the above-captioned case recommending that I GRANT defendants' Motions to Dismiss (## 8, 14, 21, 39) because the court lacks subject matter jurisdiction, and DENY plaintiff's Motion for Arrest Warrant (#17) under the Admiralty Rules. No objections to the F&R were filed.

DISCUSSION

The magistrate judge makes only recommendations to the court, to which any party may file written objections. The court is not bound by the recommendations of the magistrate judge, but retains responsibility for making the final determination. The court is generally required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or

recommendation as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). However, the court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the F&R to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). While the level of scrutiny under which I am required to review the F&R depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, I am free to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's F&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Upon review, I agree with Judge Hubel's recommendation, and I ADOPT the F&R (#48) as my own opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 2nd day of September, 2009.

/s/ Michael W. Mosman
MICHAEL W. MOSMAN
United States District Court